```
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
1
     SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
      -----x
 2
3
     ZIONESS MOVEMENT, INC.,
 4
                    Plaintiff,
5
                                              21-CV-07429 (AKH)
                V.
6
     THE LAWFARE PROJECT, INC.,
                                             Trial
 7
                    Defendant.
8
                                              New York, N.Y.
9
                                              March 5, 2024
                                              10:00 a.m.
10
     Before:
11
                        HON. ALVIN K. HELLERSTEIN,
12
                                              District Judge
13
                                                -and a Jury-
14
                               APPEARANCES
15
     FELICELLO LAW, P.C.
16
          Attorneys for Plaintiff
     BY: ROSEANNE E. FELICELLO
17
          KRISTIE M. BLASE
          MICHAEL J. MALONEY
18
     OVED & OVED LLP
19
          Attorneys for Defendant
     BY: AARON SOLOMON
20
          DARREN OVED
          TIMOTHY SAVITSKY
21
     ALSO PRESENT: JARROD BERNSTEIN
22
                    ZIPORAH REICH
23
24
25
```

1 (In open court)

THE COURT: Good morning, everyone. Any questions before we begin? Please be seated.

MS. FELICELLO: Your Honor, we do have some housekeeping matters to take care of.

THE COURT: I can't hear you. You need to speak -MS. FELICELLO: Sorry. We do have some housekeeping
matters to take care of.

THE COURT: We'll take care of them right now.

MS. FELICELLO: Okay. The first one is very minor, your Honor. My partner Michael Maloney may have to step out during some of the proceedings. Just wanted to let you know.

THE COURT: I don't care. He doesn't need my permission. We don't have any passkeys to go to the bathroom here.

MS. FELICELLO: Thank you, your Honor. In docket 1888 that you recently issued, we said that we would deal with adverse inferences at trial. You had already made a determination about some adverse inferences in docket 120, and plaintiff relied on those adverse inferences in both preparing for trial and preparing the proposed jury instructions. We'd like to discuss those with you.

THE COURT: Witnesses will be appearing, right?

MS. FELICELLO: Witnesses will be appearing, yes, your

Honor.

035RZI01 1 THE COURT: Both sides consented to that, right? 2 MS. FELICELLO: Excuse me? THE COURT: Both -- who is shaking their head at me? 3 4 MR. OVED: That's me. 5 THE COURT: Do I need you to shake your head to say I'm right or wrong? 6 7 Sorry, your Honor. MR. OVED: MS. FELICELLO: Your Honor, the adverse inferences had 8 to do with the ownership of the trademark and the separate --9 10 THE COURT: Don't mention trademark. It has to do 11 with what goes on at trial. That's the subject of testimony by 12 Amanda Berman and by Brooke Goldstein. 13 MS. FELICELLO: Yes, your Honor. 14 THE COURT: I'll get to adverse inferences if and when 15 the issue arises, but I can't tell you anything in advance about it. 16 17 MS. FELICELLO: Okay. Can I just direct your 18 attention, your Honor, to docket 120 in which you ordered that ZMI is entitled to the inferences that LPI and ZMI functioned 19 20 as independent entities. 21 THE COURT: Because there was an absent witness but 22 now the witness is here.

MS. FELICELLO: No, your Honor that was related to sanctions on The Lawfare Project because of their failure to produce a competent witness.

23

24

25

035RZI01 1 THE COURT: But now the witness is coming, right. 2 MS. FELICELLO: I assume that their witness will be 3 appearing, your Honor. 4 THE COURT: Yeah, you consented to it. 5 MS. FELICELLO: I did not consent. 6 THE COURT: What else do you have? 7 MS. FELICELLO: Okay. There's a few other things. We 8 would like to discuss the proposed jury instructions. 9 THE COURT: Not at this time. 10 MS. FELICELLO: Okay. THE COURT: That will be when it's time for it. 11 12 MS. FELICELLO: Just one clarity on the docket 120, 13 are you rescinding that order you issued in docket 120? 14 THE COURT: What is docket 120? 15 MS. FELICELLO: That's the adverse inference order --THE COURT: Didn't I just tell you what I'm going to 16 17 do with adverse inference. 18 MS. FELICELLO: I just wanted to make clear --19 THE COURT: Don't make clear. Did you hear what I 20 said? 21 MS. FELICELLO: Yes, your Honor. 22 THE COURT: What else?

23

24

25

MS. FELICELLO: I wanted to see if the witnesses are going to appear 40/20 or have the witness appear once with each party taking their turns.

035R7T01

1 THE COURT: Have you had a trial before? 2 MS. FELICELLO: Yes, your Honor but different judges 3 handle it different ways. 4 THE COURT: We go according to a trial. When one side 5 finishes then the other one starts. 6 MS. FELICELLO: Thank you, your Honor. We have two 7 demonstratives that we like to use, one in the opening, one in the closing. How would your Honor like --8 9 THE COURT: Just show me after jury selection and make 10 sure your adversary sees it. MS. FELICELLO: Okay. Thank you. We have binders of 11 12 exhibits. Would you like for those to be presented to the jury 13 or how would you like to handle that? 14 THE COURT: You have what? 15 MS. FELICELLO: Binders full of exhibits. 16 THE COURT: Give them to my law Clark. 17 MR. COLEMAN: Okay. There's two witnesses that we 18 understand will be remote, your Honor. THE COURT: Brooke and Ms. Jones. 19 20 MS. FELICELLO: Okay. Thank you. We attempted to 21 reach agreement with opposing counsel on some of the objections 22 to the exhibits -- but we were unable to -- they didn't respond 23 to our --24 THE COURT: I'll take the objections as they came in. 25 MS. FELICELLO: Excuse me? I didn't hear you.

THE COURT: I'll take the objections as they come in. Are we ready for the jury?

MS. FELICELLO: Are the exhibits that are not objected to deemed admitted, or are you still going to rule on them, your Honor?

THE COURT: I don't know. I'll rule on them as they come in.

MS. FELICELLO: Okay. I think that's all I had on my list. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

MR. SOLOMON: Good morning, Judge. One issue is that Brooke Goldstein from Lawfare, her son fell ill last night so she didn't fly in this morning, she's flying in later. Is it possible for her to observe today via Zoom.

THE COURT: No. We'd have to set it up.

MR. SOLOMON: That's fine, Judge, thank you.

THE COURT: If we have to take the testimony today because you told me that witness can't come today and it's the first witness. We're going to have jury selection and openings today, and start the testimony at 10:00 tomorrow morning.

(Continued on next page)

1 (A jury of eight was impaneled and sworn)
2 THE COURT: Did you all say "I do"?

JUROR: I do.

JUROR: I do.

JUROR: I do.

JUROR: I do.

THE COURT: All right. As I told you previously, your function is going to be to be the triers of fact. You will listen to all the evidence in the case, and based on all the evidence and my legal instructions, you will then be able to come to a true verdict. I will not interfere with your being the triers of fact, and you have to take the law as I give it.

A general word about evidence: There are two kinds, direct and circumstantial. Contrary to what you may have heard, each category of evidence is worthy of the same kind of attention as everyone else. And there can be strong circumstantial evidence and weak circumstantial evidence, strong direct evidence and weak direct evidence, and mistaken direct evidence and improper inferences. It's all a mix. We depend on you, the jury, to bring your common sense and your experience in life to bear to find out which witnesses are credible and which are not, which inferences should be made and which should not. There's no inherent strength or weakness to evidence. Each type of evidence has its own strength and its own weakness.

| 035RZI02

Direct evidence is that which we see or hear or read, that appeals directly to our senses, and we can report that. Circumstantial evidence is evidence that we reason from some other type of evidence. For example, if all the shutters are closed and someone comes in dripping with rain, with water, you can assume it was raining outside. That's circumstantial evidence. As I say, each can be strong and each can be weak, and I'll give you rules at the end of the case for deciding the credibility of the witnesses and the inference to take from witnesses.

Now, it's very important to follow a number of rules. First, evidence is here in the courtroom, not outside the courtroom. Do not do any research on the internet or anywhere else. You'll be hearing about trademarks. Don't look them up. You'll be hearing from different witnesses. Don't look them up. Everything will come that you need to decide in this courtroom. Now, why do we say that? We say that because every piece of evidence here, for a number of reasons, can be checked and cross-examined by the lawyers. So you have the benefit of their history with this case, their experience with this case and their ability to question witnesses on the case, so it's better to be able to separate what is exaggerated, what's real, what's true and what is not. That's the first reason.

The second reason is that you are all equal. No juror is entitled to more judgment because that juror may have

17 degrees as opposed to someone who has no degrees. You each have your common sense in which to deliberate and work together. No juror is an expert as to any other juror. You are all equal. Now, if someone does research and reports to that jury, that person becomes a witness, not a juror, and tries to abrogate weight and experience to himself than anyone else because he has more knowledge. He gained it on the internet. No, no. You're equal, and you cannot bring any kind of knowledge of something else and some kind of subject into the jury room. All the evidence that you need, all the information that you need will come from here.

Now, as the evidence comes in, lawyers will object.

They're entitled to object, and I'll rule on the objections.

The lawyers can only say one word. They will say, "Objection."

They are not going to give any speeches. It's not going to be like television. No lawyers will give a speech unless in opening or in closing. If you object, it's one word. You stand up, "Objection." I'll rule. There will be no sidebars unless I need them. If I don't need a sidebar, you can ask for it. I'm not going to give it to you.

This trial will be efficient. I understand that you are giving time from your lives, so we'll have an efficient trial, and I hope an interesting trial so that you can look upon this experience as a valuable experience in your life, and you will be doing justice to the parties. There's no higher

calling in this country, in this democracy with all its troubles, than doing justice, doing justice between two people in a controversy, finding the facts and ruling according to the law.

Evidence comes in piecemeal. You'll hear one witness, another witness. They may not all be in a chronology, and they may not fit together until the end of the case. Your job is to keep an open mind; open until the very end of the case, until all the evidence is in, until you've heard the summations of the lawyers, and you hear my legal instructions. It's very important. Because if you try to summarize the case or feel that you have a handle on the case before its finished, you tend to close up your mind to the process, and you try to look for ways supporting your reasons. So you must keep an open mind.

The second thing, don't discuss the case with anyone else, and don't discuss the case amongst yourselves until it's over. Then it will be time for deliberating. Again, when you tend to talk about the case, you tend to reach certain conclusions in your mind and your mind will start to close if it's not open and fair and impartial to the very end. So don't do research. Don't engage in conversations about the case, not with anyone else.

Now, you may be on social media, and if you say I've got this case and you talk about it, other people will talk to

035RZI02

you about it. And so, again, it's a danger that your mind will close up or be influenced by information outside of this jury room. Don't use social media in any way having to do with this trial during this case. I doubt that there will be any newspaper references. If there are, don't pay attention to them. Or radio references or TV references, don't pay attention to them. The only important thing is coming out of this jury box and the documents that come into evidence.

Now, we will begin our day at 10:00 a.m. We cannot begin until every one of you jurors is here and the lawyers are here as well. So if anyone is late, everyone will be late and we impose on everyone else. So we must be on time. Those of you who travel from a distance, or even a short distance and use buses and subways, know that they are prone to delay. Account for that because if you are delayed, it imposes on everyone else. If it's inevitable and you are delayed,

Ms. Jones will give you a telephone number to call so you can let us know. And she will take your number so in case we have to communicate with you, we'll be able to do that.

The lawyers and the parties are not to talk to you, not even to say, hello or goodbye or how are you. If they see you in the elevator, they must exit the elevator. There must be no contact between the lawyers and anyone on the jury. We concern ourselves not only with justice but with the appearance of justice as well. The lawyers will address you formally in

court and nowhere else. And it's important for you not to gather anywhere. If you come early, go directly into the jury room. We're going to try and have coffee for you, and you wait in the jury room. Do not linger in the hallways, and do not make eye contact or do anything else with the lawyers.

Today we're going to hear the openings of the lawyers. Tomorrow we'll start with the witnesses. And as I said, we will not be working on Friday. Today is Tuesday, we'll be working today in a very limited way and tomorrow and Thursday. On Thursday, we're going to have to stop at 4:00. We've got 45 minutes to lunchtime. I think we can have the openings now and then we'll break, and you'll be able to go home for the day and come back tomorrow at 10:00.

Is that a good plan? Yes?

JUROR: Sorry, I missed this before. You think it's going to take like a week, you said? Around there?

THE COURT: Say again.

JUROR: How long do you think we'll be here for the whole trial? A week, I think you said.

THE COURT: About seven days.

JUROR: I'm sorry. I think you addressed this, but if I'm unavailable the week of the 18th --

THE COURT: Sorry?

JUROR: If I'm unavailable the week of the 18th?

THE COURT: We're not going that far. We'll be

finished before that.

035RZI02

Ms. Jones, are you giving out the notebooks?

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Can I get ten minutes and bring them into the back?

THE COURT: We're going to give you notebooks so those of you that want to take notes can take notes. If you take notes, they are only for yourself. You cannot prove a point to another juror through your notes. Your notes are just useful as a reminder to yourself. Some people are good at taking notes. Some people, not so good. Some people just prefer to hear the testimony rather than take notes. For some, it helps you to hear; others, it gets in the way. You do what is good for you. Those of you who take notes, take notes.

If you have questions about the jury, about the things that come up, you can send me a note or ask me. This trial is to give you information. The problem about that is that the lawyers know what they are going to do and something comes up in sequence, it's not always the right sequence. But if you have questions, you can ask me. We'll run a trial that will give you the information you need to make an informed judgment.

I don't think I've charged you about preponderance of the evidence. I will at the end, but I might as well tell you about it now. A civil case is decided by a preponderance of the evidence. If you think of a scale, a weight scale, the person who has to prove a point has to prove it to tip the

| 035RZI02

scale ever so slightly. If the person fails to tip that scale, the person has failed in its burden of proof. If it's equal, it does not prove the point. You have to tip the scale ever so slightly to prove a point by a preponderance of the evidence. The plaintiff has a burden to prove the case by a preponderance of the evidence, but if there are defenses in the case, sometimes defendant will have a burden with regard to a defense. We'll get to that at the end of the case, and I'll instruct you.

Ms. Jones needs a couple of minutes to get you the notebooks, and then we'll hear the openings of the lawyers.

And then we'll break for lunch, and you'll have the rest of the day free.

Yes?

MR. OVED: Your Honor, perhaps we could have a sidebar addressing the  $-\!\!\!-$ 

THE COURT: I can't hear you.

MR. OVED: Perhaps we can have a sidebar addressing the exhibit they want to show the jury at the opening, the demonstrative aid.

THE COURT: Take the podium. I'm not able to hear you.

MR. OVED: I said, while the jury is taking their attendance, perhaps we can have a sidebar to address that demonstrative aid that was presented to us.

```
035RZI02
```

```
1
               THE COURT: All right. Yes. Come in the robing room.
 2
      You can stay in your place. We'll be finished with this in
      five minutes.
 3
 4
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: Judge, I'm going to take the jury
5
      in the back.
6
               THE COURT: You want to go in the back?
 7
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: Yes.
8
              THE COURT: Okay. Go with Ms. Jones. Don't discuss
      the case. Drew will pick up the questionnaires.
9
10
              Be seated, please. Did you lose something?
11
               JUROR: Yes. It's okay. Thank you.
12
               (Jury not present)
13
              THE COURT: Let's get to the demonstratives.
14
              MS. FELICELLO: Should we put it on the screen, your
      Honor?
15
               THE COURT: That's going to be in evidence, isn't it?
16
17
              MS. FELICELLO: Yes. It's from Plaintiff's
     Exhibit 60.
18
19
              THE COURT: What do you want to do with it?
20
              MS. FELICELLO: We have it blown up as a cardboard.
21
     We would like to show it to the jury in my opening.
22
               THE COURT: Any objection?
23
              MR. SOLOMON: Yes, Judge. It's not a demonstrative.
24
      It's not used to be a presentation of evidence. It's an
25
      excerpt of Plaintiff's Exhibit 60, and it's --
```

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Your objection is sustained. This will be evidentiary, and it will come in. The purpose of an opening is not to prove the case, it's to inform the jury how the case connects one to the other. You'll have time to do that at the end. MS. FELICELLO: Okay. Thank you. MR. SOLOMON: Thank you, Judge. THE COURT: Anything else? MS. FELICELLO: Not at this time. MR. SOLOMON: Nothing for the defense. MS. FELICELLO: One thing, your Honor. Is it possible to have a microphone at the bench because it's really difficult for all of us to hear you? THE COURT: I'll put on my microphone. MS. FELICELLO: Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: I am sorry about that. MR. OVED: Thank you. I will say, your Honor, that your hearing must be impeccable because you have no problem hearing anybody here, and I can't hear anybody. It's amazing. THE COURT: It's not so good. (Pause) THE DEPUTY CLERK: Are you ready, Judge? THE COURT: Ready.

(Jury present)

THE DEPUTY CLERK: I'll bring them out in a second.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: How long will your opening be?

MS. FELICELLO: About 15 to 20 minutes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And how long will yours be, Mr. Solomon?

MR. SOLOMON: I'll do the opening, your Honor, about 15 minutes.

THE COURT: Would you want to have lunch and come back because this can run to, you know, 1:30 or 2:00.

JUROR: We're fine with doing it now.

THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.

MS. FELICELLO: May I approach the podium?

MS. FELICELLO: Good afternoon, your Honor, ladies and gentlemen of the jury. My name is Roseanne Felicello, and I, together with my team, represent Zioness Movement, Inc.

As Judge Hellerstein mentioned to you, this a trademark infringement matter. I'll will not describe for you some of the key facts that will be coming into evidence in this matter through the witness and documents that you'll see. As you listen to the testimony and review the documents, I want you to keep one thing in mind: Not any witness is going to have the full story or provide all of the evidence that you will need to reach a conclusion in this matter in favor of Zioness on its claims. Rather, each witness, each document is like a piece of a puzzle, and it will be at the end of the proceeding that we'll put the pieces together and see the evidence clearly and see that Zioness has proven its claims.

Felicello - Opening

Some pieces of the puzzle are obviously larger and more important in the matter than others, but no one piece is complete.

I will start now by describing how those pieces -- how some of those pieces fit together, but it will be at the end of trial that I'll speak to you again and put it all together for you. The first question that you might have is: What is Zioness Movement? It's a nonprofit, New York entity, and the evidence will show that it was established by Amanda Berman in February 2018. It's a progressive and Zionist organization that educates and motivates. Ms. Berman and her team engage in speaking engagements, write op-eds and promote the idea of Zioness.

You will hear that the Zioness Movement operates with its own board of directors, submits its own tax returns, maintains its own financial accounts and is a completely independent organization. The evidence will also show that Zioness Movement applied for a trademark in the word "Zioness" back in April 2018. The mark was then published for opposition by the United States Patent and Trademark Office, and no opposition was submitted to the mark. In due course, in May 2020, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office registered the trademark to Zioness Movement, Inc.

With that background, you might be wondering why you're here to help resolve a dispute about the ownership of

the trademark Zioness. Let me explain. You will hear claims by defendant, The Lawfare Project, that it owns the trademark in Zioness rather than Zioness Movement. So what is The Lawfare Project and what is its relationship to Zioness? The evidence will show that The Lawfare Project is a not-for-profit District of Columbia entity. It operates as a nonprofit law firm, and it was established by Brooke Goldstein, who was its founder and executive director. Ms. Goldstein a public figure known for her conservative views, who frequently appears in the media. The evidence will show that the law firm brings lawsuits in favor — in support of Jewish rights.

The evidence will also show that from March 2015 to December 31, 2018, Amanda Berman worked as an employee at The Lawfare Project. She was an attorney for The Lawfare Project, and she was the main attorney for The Lawfare Project working on an important case that The Lawfare Project had brought in connection with issues happening at the San Francisco State University. That matter was gearing up for trial in March of 2019. You will also hear that Amanda's employee agreement with The Lawfare Project specifically permitted her to work on outside pursuits during her employment at Zioness — sorry, at The Lawfare Project.

Where does Zioness fit in? The evidence will show that the first time the word "Zioness" was used as a brand was when Amanda and Brooke together, and about a dozen others who

Felicello - Opening

were unrelated to The Lawfare Project, attended what is called SlutWalk in Chicago in August 2017. What is SlutWalk? I didn't know what it was either before I started working on this case. The SlutWalk is a progressive demonstration against rape culture.

The evidence will show that the organizers of the SlutWalk had previously said that Stars of David were not allowed at the walk, that participants in the walk couldn't wear the Jewish symbol and also participate in this progressive walk against rape culture. Soon — a few days prior to the walk, they relented and said, Okay, you can wear your Stars of David. And based on that, Amanda, who the evidence will show is a progressive, comes from a progressive background, saw an opportunity to bridge a gap by participating in the event as progressive Zionists.

Amanda and Brooke decided to recruit some others to join them under the Zioness brand and to march as a core unit in support of Zioness also wearing the Stars of David and branding related to Zioness. They did not have any attire or insignia referencing The Lawfare Project. They never promoted themselves while they were there as being members of the Lawfare Project or employees of The Lawfare Project. And the evidence will show that there was no connection between their appearance at the SlutWalk and their work for The Lawfare Project, which, again, is a nonprofit law firm, not a protest

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

organization. The Lawfare Project did not pay for Amanda's time to attend the SlutWalk event, and Amanda and Brooke told the then chair of The Lawfare Project, Lawrence Hill, that their attendance was for Zioness, not Lawfare Project. After their appearance at the SlutWalk, which gained a lot of attention in the media, interest in the idea of Zioness grew. The evidence will show that there seemed to be a need for this progressive and Zionist pro-female organization to exist and donors were interested.

At the beginning, you will hear evidence that Brooke caused The Lawfare Project to provide -- to advance some of the early costs associated with the Zioness Movement for t-shirts, things like that. But the evidence will also show that Amanda was always the face of Zioness, and media coverage portrayed her as the founder with no objection by Brooke. You will hear that Brooke attended one other event as part of Zioness in October 2017, but that she then soon lost interest. And by November 2017, Brooke told Amanda that Lawfare was not going to advance any additional costs, all costs that had been advanced would need to be repaid. Once Amanda went out and set up this organization, which she also recognized and Amanda was planning to do. Amanda agreed, and you will see documents showing that Amanda requested an accounting from the Lawfare Project as to what was owed so The Lawfare Project could be paid back. accounting was never provided.

activities as well.

RZIO2 Felicello - Opening

The evidence will also show, also, in 2019 Amanda continued to work at The Lawfare Project and also continuously continued to build up Zioness Movement. She registered Zioness Movement, as they discussed, as a separate entity in February 2018. She formed an independent board of directors. There was no overlap between the board of directors of Zioness Movement and The Lawfare Project. She opened a bank account over which no one at Lawfare Project had any control, and she began to raise money for Zioness. All of this was out in the open. The evidence will show that Brooke Goldstein and the board of directors of the Lawfare Project were aware of these activities and generally supportive. Brooke, in fact, was generally supportive, but she knew she was not directing the

The evidence will show that Brooke did not always agree with some of the progressive messaging put out by Zioness on its Facebook page or in literature or in the news, but she knew and recognized that she did not have any control over the Zioness messaging. In fact, the evidence will show that she acknowledged that Amanda owned a trademark in the word "Zioness."

By the end of 2018, Amanda was ready to devote her full-time resources to Zioness Movement and leave The Lawfare Project. She informed Brooke in late November or early December, and at the beginning -- at first, Brooke was

supportive of Amanda leaving to run Zioness full time. The evidence will show that she took her out for dinner. She gave her a hug. You'll see an email, which she sent in mid December, wishing Amanda the best, wishing her success in her endeavor in this new organization. And she placed no conditions on Amanda's departure from The Lawfare Project.

Within a few weeks, however, by the end of December prior to Amanda's last official day at The Lawfare Project, which would have been December 31, Brooke had Ben Ryberg, the COO of The Lawfare Project, turn off Amanda's access to her email and her documents at The Lawfare Project.

The evidence will show that this was problematic.

Because remember I mentioned that Amanda was working on that significant case for The Lawfare Project that was about to go to trial in March of 2019. Even after her planned departure from The Lawfare Project, Amanda had agreed that she would continue to work on that trial on behalf of the clients of the Lawfare Project. But in order to do that, she needed access to her documents that were at the Lawfare and on The Lawfare Project servers. And in fact, Lawfare Project's cocounsel in that important trial in San Francisco was Lawrence Hill — sorry, counsel was Winston Strong, which was the law firm that the then chairman of the Lawfare Project, Lawrence Hill, was associated with.

So let me just be clear about that. We have Lawrence

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

035RZI02

Felicello - Opening

Hill, who was then the chairman of the board of The Lawfare He was also a partner at a law firm called Winston Project. Strong. Winston Strong was the large law firm that was cocounseling on The Lawfare Project on the San Francisco State litigation that was going to trial in March 2019. His firm, his partners, desperately wanted Amanda to continue working on the trial. And so, he expressed objection to Brooke about shutting down Amanda's access to her email. And you'll see this in evidence. There are emails showing his disagreement with Ms. Goldstein. In fact, the evidence will show that the dispute was so untenable that Mr. Hill resigned from the board of directors at The Lawfare Project over Brooke's actions against Ms. Berman.

But all of this also shows that the evidence -- sorry. The evidence also shows that none of these issues that Brooke professed to have against Amanda at the end of December 2018, and her reason for cutting off her access to the email, had anything to do with the trademark. They had nothing to do with the trademark. There was no emails or text messages or any documentary evidence from Brooke in this time period expressing any concern about Amanda leaving Lawfare Project to run Zioness or her use of the Zioness mark.

In fact, Brooke did not assert that The Lawfare Project had a superior right to the Zioness trademark until months after the San Francisco state case settled, which was in

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Felicello - Opening

the spring of 2019. The evidence will show that it wasn't until June of 2019, about six months after Amanda Berman left her employment at The Lawfare Project, that The Lawfare Project added to its website the language that it founded, incubated and funded the Zioness Movement. The Lawfare Project website did not include this language in 2017, and it did not include this language in 2018.

The evidence will also show that Zioness Movement never mentioned to its bookkeeper or accountant or auditor that it had a trademark or any trademark rights at all to include in the books and records of The Lawfare Project.

Despite this evidence that I described that you will see and hear through trial, Lawfare would like you to find that it first used the mark Zioness as a brand identifier in August 2017, continued to use it and did not abandon it. facts as will be shown in the evidence just do not support The Lawfare Project's claims.

The evidence will show that in August 2020, about a year after The Lawfare Project added the statement to its website, Brooke calls The Lawfare Project to file a petition to cancel the Zioness Movement's trademark in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. This is an administrative proceeding with more limited discovery and more limited damages that can be It's simply an injunctive order that can be received achieved. that the mark is either canceled or not canceled.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

035RZI02 Felicello - Opening

Also, a few months later in October 2020, the evidence will show that the Twitter handle @TheSmartZioness appeared. This handle sometimes wrote messages that were critical of Zioness Movement and other times claimed to be Zioness Movement, and sometimes wrote messages that were critical of just of Amanda Berman.

After The Lawfare Project refused to meaningfully participate in the discovery process in front of the United States Trial and Patent Appeal Board, which is the PTAB in which they filed a petition to cancel, and because of the existential threat to the organization of canceling the word "Zioness" or "Zioness Movement," Zioness was forced to come to this Court and file this claim. That would cover for the continuing infringement and the reputational harm that The Lawfare Project was causing by continuing to claim that it founded, incubated and funded Zioness Movement.

The evidence will show that Zioness Movement has spent significant sums on legal fees to defend against this Lawfare -- unleashed by The Lawfare Project against its former employee. Zioness Movement seeks to recover for the harm caused to The Lawfare Project to the Zioness brand and reputation.

Zioness is unapologetically progressive. You'll see that in the evidence. You'll also see in the evidence that is the polar opposite of the values expressed by Brooke Goldstein

and associated with her organization, The Lawfare Project. But improperly claiming ownership and founding the Zioness Movement on The Lawfare Project's website, Brooke has maligned the reputation of Zioness by associating it with conservative views.

On behalf of Zioness Movement, I thank you for your service and your time. Thank you very much. I'll be back to speak to you at the end of the trial.

THE COURT: Defense opening.

MR. SOLOMON: Good afternoon. My name is Aaron Solomon. I'm a partner at the law firm of Oved & Oved, and with me today, my partner Darren Oved and my associate, Tim Savitsky. We represent The Lawfare Project. We start off by thanking you-all for taking time away from your families, your jobs and everything you have going on, and focusing on the two parties in this case and helping us come to a resolution.

As you've heard from opposing counsel, no one disputes that the trademark Zioness was used for the first time in August 2017. But by who? Who used it first in commerce? You just heard from opposing counsel that their position is there's no connection between the use of the word "Zioness" on August 12, 2017, at the Chicago SlutWalk, which sounds as weird for me to say in court as it is for you to hear, there was no connection between the two whatsoever.

The reality is the term "Zioness" was a mark, a

trademark, that was cultivated, incubated, funded and done, for lack of a better word, by Lawfare. Let's back up to the summer of 2017. Lawfare is a not-for-profit organization. Its mission is to fight anti-Semitism, and it does it in many different ways. It's a civil rights organization protecting the minority people, Jewish people. How does it do it? Sometimes it files lawsuits on behalf of plaintiffs; people who feel they have personally experienced anti-Semitism. It does speaking engagements. It does grassroots movements. It does communications and education. There are a myriad of ways it does what it is, but what it does is fight anti-Semitism.

The executive director for all the time it matters, from inception to today, is Brooke Goldstein. She's the executive director of The Lawfare Project. What does that mean? She sets the agenda. What projects are we going to do? How are we going to do them? Who is going to do them? Tells people what to do. We will do this. I want this by Monday. I want this by Tuesday. I want to have this ready by Monday.

(Continued on next page)

MR. SOLOMON: She gives deadlines.

In summer of 2017 you have Brooke Goldstein, and you'll meet her. You have Amanda Berman, she is the director of legal affairs for the Lawfare Project. And you have Ben Ryberg. He is the COO. He handles websites. He handles payment of bills. He's integral as well.

As opposing counsel mentioned, 2017 in the summer there was an event happening in Chicago called The SlutWalk. It was a march designed to demonstrate against violence against woman, sexual abuse, rape culture, domestic violence. But there was an issue, and antisemitic issue which was that while that group allowed certain cultures and certain people to bring their national symbols, their flags, the Jewish people weren't allowed to bring their flags. That was a problem for The Lawfare because it fit directly with what The Lawfare does, it fights antisemitism, that was a problem for Brooke Goldstein.

While opposing counsel may make it sound like Brooke and Amanda just went to the SlutWalk. They just went there like you would go to the Yankee game tonight. They didn't. The reality is it wasn't casual. Lawfare, before the SlutWalk, which is August 12, 2017, begins a campaign. What do they do? They a PR company already in place that public relations company is called Miller Inc. What they do is they go back to Miller Inc., that Lawfare has an engagement letter with and that Lawfare pays and says, we're doing a new campaign. We

need a word for it. We need a term to bring to this March.

And they have a new arrangement with the PR company. Who has that arrangement? Lawfare. Who pays that company? Lawfare.

And the first thing that PR company does is they try to come up a term, a word for Lawfare to use at this March.

One word that's generated is "Zioness." Brooke responds immediately in an email, love it. Love it. Amanda responds she likes it to. But she would prefer "Zioness Slut."

Amanda's response is, in sum and substance, that may not be going over so well with the ACLU and some other things. More importantly, we want this term, this logo, this name, to live beyond this march. We want to use it in connection with other stuff Lawfare does. We don't want to do just go to this march, the SlutWalk. Zioness Slut, SlutWalk that's a one-and-done.

We want this to be used in connection with all of the progressive things that Lawfare does.

Because contrary to what you are going to hear,

Lawfare is a not-for-profit organization that fights

antisemitism. It is not conservative, liberal, progressive,

right wing, left wing. It fights antisemitism. The people who

work there have their own beliefs.

And it is true and everyone recognized that Brooke Goldstein has appeared on conservative media outlets. She has been on Fox News. So recognizing that, and from day one, there was to be some sort of separation between Lawfare publicly and

the Zioness term. But we'll get into that in a few minutes.

First, let's go back. You have Miller Inc. creating the mark. You got Lawfare paying for it. Then you have the idea, not only do we want to bring a term to this march, we want to bring posters. We want to have T-shirts. Who doesn't love T-shirts, right? So what are they going to do, they hire a creative design company. Who hires them? Lawfare. Who pays them? Lawfare. The creative design company comes up with different designs, images. Brooke edits them. Brooke gives final approval. Brooke gives deadlines. Brooke critiques them. Brooke makes the final decision.

Now, the next thing that happens is a website, let's have a website, Zioness.org. Who registers it? Lawfare. Who pays for it? Lawfare. The company who registered it with — excuse me, not the company who registered it, the company that hosts it, I'm not a web guy. The company who hosts it is Wix.com, that's the platform. The invoices from Wix.com goes to Ben Ryberg at Lawfare. Lawfare registers the domain name, Zioness.org The password for anyone to edit that domain name, Lawfare.

And before they go to the SlutWalk, Lawfare wants to issue a statement, a press release to its donors to its supporters, to anyone who might want to be interested in going to going to this or to get attention to it. So they have the PR company draft one of those too. Who edits it? Brooke. And

Brooke's edits are very important. She edits it to say, put something in about Lawfare. So you'll see that the introduction the world gets, the press release the world gets about Zioness includes -- and I think it's Paragraph 2 -- if you love Lawfare, check out its new project, Zioness, that's the sum and substance of it.

And Amanda puts that edit in for Brooke. Why?

Because Brooke is the boss. So when Brooke says, that's the edit that should go in, there is colloquy, but Brooke has the final say on what goes in. And that's on August 6, 2017, the press release goes out to Lawfare's contacts. Amanda sends that email, that's true, to Lawfare's contacts, which she has access to because she is a Lawfare employee. She sends it from her account, @Lawfare.com. The bottom email has her signature block, Amanda Berman, Lawfare.com.

Now, armed with these T-shirts, posters, the slogan, "Zioness," Amanda and Brooke go to the SlutWalk in Chicago on August 12, 2017. They fly out there -- because we are in New York, it's in Chicago -- with tickets paid for by Lawfare. They stay in a hotel paid for by Lawfare.

And it is a hit. This movement gets attention. And this whole time and thereafter everyone is looking to Brooke for direction. She makes edits. She sets the agenda. She gives deadlines.

As I said before right off the bat, everyone knew this

progressive campaign can't really have Brooke be the frontman of it or front person of it because Brooke has been on Fox News. It might not be very normal to have a Fox News talking head at a march with progressive issues. So that's discussed openly. And the decision is made that Amanda — while Brooke is the showpiece and the spokesperson for Lawfare, Amanda will be the public figurehead of Zioness.

September 2017, now that this thing is something that they need to protect, they discuss with their pro bono attorneys, Winston & Strawn. Lawfare has pro bono counsel.

Why? It's an organization that does philanthropic things.

Winston & Strawn has agreed to do work for them for free. They reach out to their contact at Winston & Strawn and say, we have this trademark, what can we do? He goes at least you can put a TM on it, trademark, write that on there, and we will help you guys register the trademark. Who is the client going to be?

Lawfare. Amanda is on that email, she says nothing because Lawfare is running this project. This is a project of The Lawfare.

Now, we have T-shirts. We have posters. We are going to do other marches. We need donations. So people who want to donate are going to click on a PayPal button and send money in. But whose PayPal account is it? Lawfare's. So the same issue comes up, wait a second, the people who are really super-duper progressive may not want to donate to Lawfare. Maybe they

will, maybe they don't. What do we do? And it's discussed between Amanda, Brooke, the PR company, and Ben. And Amanda says, yeah, it's not ideal that there would be a Lawfare receipt you'd get when you want to donate to Zioness, you get a Lawfare receipt. But in her words, she is OK with it because it is definitely a project of The Lawfare.

Around October of 2017 there is chatter online regarding Brooke being involved in the Zioness movement. The Zioness movement is pitched, from the get-go, as having co-founders. Amanda is one of them. No one ever says who the other one is. You know, why? Because it's Brooke. But the PR company says, listen, we need to have a public face to this. We have to disassociate Brooke from this. So now we have the issue is we need to get donations, we can't really have Brooke be the figurehead, what should we do? We'll start a new 501(c)(3), a new charity to receive the donations from the Zioness project. No problem.

But here is the deal, Lawfare owns the trademark they already do. It exists the minute it's used in commerce. So Brooke agrees with Amanda, you can use it. It's a great project. You're doing great work. Keep doing your job at Lawfare, which is going to be this Zioness project amongst other things. Everyone wears many hats. Keep doing it. Lawfare will let you use it and give you a license for the trademark — although no one calls it a license because we're

not trademark attorneys. We'll let you use the trademark, but you've got to do two things. One, this new company, when it starts making money, has got to pay us back for the money we shelled out to get this off the ground because we are not going to make any more money off it. And two, you got to fly straight. We don't control you directly, but you've got to do stuff The Lawfare would be OK with. Yes, you are progressive. We know that. God bless you. But you can't go off the rails. We have a license. You have to listen to us, that's the deal. And a new 501(c)(3) is formed beginning in February 2018, and Brooke does what she does. She doesn't lose interest, she moves on to the next project. Amanda's in place. She's taking care of it. She's got it. What is the next thing we have to fight? What's the next injustice we have to take care of?

Now, towards the end of 2018, Brooke and Amanda do butt heads because Brooke is the boss of Lawfare. She doesn't like everything that Amanda is doing with Zioness. That's the occupational hazard of being the boss, people don't like being told what to do. So they start butting heads and in the end of 2018 Amanda decides she is quitting. She's leaving. She does, and that's OK. That's fine. She is going to run Zioness, which is that's fine. She's devoted so much of her time to it anyway, what's the difference? Fine. No problem. But the deal doesn't change. Lawfare owns the trademark. We're letting you use it. You've got to pay us back and fly

straight.

But then they start going through emails and they find out, because Amanda wouldn't turnover her work product, that unbeknownst to Lawfare, she filed the trademark for Zioness in the name of the new company. Now, it's true we didn't file a petition to cancel her trademark application right away. We didn't put opposition right away because we are a not-for-profit. This is a waste of a not-for-profit's money, being here. Our job is to take the donations we get and fight antisemitism, not fight trademark disputes with our former employees. We tried to resolve it. We sent not one, not two, not three, but four cease-and-desist letters to her. She won't stop.

In the end, she files a statement of use, "she" being Amanda. What does that mean? When you file a trademark there is different kinds of trademarks you could file. One of them is an intent to use. I'm going to use it in the future, I want to hold it. That's what she files. That's what Amanda files, an intent-to-use application. So at some point you have to file the I'm-now-using-it application, and she does. You know what date she picks for the date that this new company used, the new company that's called Zioness Movement Inc., what's the date that Zioness Movement Inc. says is the first time they used the trademark Zioness? August 12, 2017, at the SlutWalk before it existed and when Lawfare was funding it, running it,

it. Was a project of The Lawfare.

At some point because of this, Lawfare's donors start questioning Brooke. It's not just the public who has this question, who really is Zioness? Who is really the front of it? Their own donors start questioning it. So Brooke puts on the Lawfare web page that it was a project of Lawfare. Do you know why? It was. They claim it's infringement to do so. We incubated the project. We started it. We paid for it. We ran it until we handed the reins to Amanda with our license. That's one of their claims. They are mad about that.

The other one is that Brooke, at some point, starts a Twitter account, a so-called Twitter, with hashtag Smart Zioness. Why? She is critiquing things Amanda is doing, thinks Amanda is making mistakes. It's America, we can critique people. That's why we are here. We are here because who owns the trademark? Zioness is listed on Lawfare's website as being a project of The Lawfare, which Amanda admitted it is, and because Brooke has a Twitter handle. That's why we are here.

So when this is all said and done, we are going to ask you to declare the trademark belongs to Lawfare and that there is no infringement for either Lawfare putting on the website that it started the campaign it started, Zioness, or that Brooke's use of the hashtag a Smart Zioness constitutes infringement when it really is just critique.

Thank you or all for your patience. Thank you for 1 2 your time. We will try to make the trial as quick as possible. 3 Thank you very much. 4 THE COURT: Thank you, Counsel. Thank you, members of 5 the jury. 6 The opening statements were outlines from the lawyers 7 of what they expect to prove. The openings are not evidence themselves. It is a picture of what the lawyers expect to do 8 9 with the evidence. 10 Tomorrow morning we will start with the evidence. I 11 will see you at 10:00 in the morning. Ms. Jones will collect 12 your notebooks and give them back to you in the morning. Don't 13 discuss the case, keep an open mind. You are excused for the 14 day. Go out into the jury room. 15 I'll see you tomorrow. Thank you. 16 (Adjourned to March 5, 2024 at 10:00 a.m.) 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24